

QUESTIONS?

- Q. We have heard some rumors about reorganization. Are any further reorganization plans planned for DD/M&S?
- A. There are no specific plans for reorganization at this time, but I will not make a commitment that we will not reorganize from time to time. There are some interesting games that one can play, not games but thoughts that one can go through in terms of the Directorate. We have eight offices and two key staffs in the Directorate and this is a light span of control. I have to admit that from time to time I've wondered whether this can be compressed and have another level of management in there. Now, don't get nervous. I'm not announcing any reorganization. I'm saying there is none planned at the moment but I'm not foretelling that some time in the future, with respect to whether it be money or slot pressures or just job challenge, that I might not pick up an option of that sort or some other related option.
- Q. May I ask a question you may not have the answer for. I notice on the badge pictures, and some of the guards told me the other day that I had to be rephotographed because of my gray hair, I notice there are ties on those. Were those possibly from badge pictures? If so, some of those kids, the Office Directors, look like they need rebadged.
- STAT A. When [] was here and Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission of the Agency, he had a program of taking portraits of all the key officials in the Agency going down through at least Office Director and maybe further. I was kidding people and said, "those pictures are for your obituary." When we went through the exercise of making these viewgraphs it became apparent that when [] opted to retire from the Agency that the program fell down and I believe that the message has gotten out that it will be reinstituted and it has been reinstituted. Next year you will see better pictures. Your right!
- Q. Will you make this material presented here today available to people who were not able to come here today?
- A. I believe its being video-taped and I'll say yes to anybody, to a large group, that wants to see it as a result of the video-tape. However, I'm not sure as this is the first time I think I've been video-taped. I'm not sure how photogenic I'll be and if I look real bad, I'll kill it.
- Q. Will the charts?
- A. Oh yes, the charts can be made available. In fact, the Office Directors can get a set and use them in their staff meetings. Instead of making xerox copies, but make it on a loan basis like a library book.

- Q. I would like to see that extended out to the other people who are outside of the Office Directors.
- A. No, I want the Office Directors or Sub-career Panel Chairman to use those charts and lend them out to the various people so that the people in the DDO or M&S careerists have to have a mechanism to get exposed to that and we will try and work that out.
- Q. You explained that the average grade in the Agency is 10.17. Don't we have to maintain that 10.17 as OMB ordered?
- A. OMB does levy a maximum average grade for the Agency. I'm not sure that it is 10.17. I have a suspicion that the average grade that OMB has imposed on us was probably a little higher than that. But, we ~~have~~ always keep a few little slots open or promotions open on a serendipity basis in terms of somebody coming along and we want to have a spot to put them in. So, we don't deal all our cards at one fell swoop.
- Q. Are there any specific new term goals for the EEO program?
- A. Yes, there are extensive new term goals and if I had gone into them I think we would be here for the rest of the day. There is a heightened recruiting program in the Office of Personnel.
- STAT in the IG Office has got a very aggressive program going in terms of EEO and we may see some very dramatic outgrowths of some of these exercises in the EEO in the educational field. Since these plans are not locked in concrete it is rather difficult for me to let them all out at this moment. The Director has focused on that and I believe everybody is feeling the heat and the pressure.
- Q. Are there any plans for expanding the off-campus training program with more courses?
- A. This expansion can take place, but it really is a function of the people. You ask for it and there are enough, you'll get it. I feel guilty about bringing an instructor here for the off-campus program for five people but if you had something like twenty or thereabouts. I guess that twenty-some odd is about the breakeven point.
- Q. As one who doesn't work in the Headquarters area and is assigned outside, and is not privy to perhaps a lot of the discussion that goes on here concerning parking situations, I read your five-page opus the other day and find it interesting that apparently it's possible to publish all sorts of things that may or may not be secret that applies to the Agency. Yet it appears that if I mispark I may be jailed. On the parking situation, how might it apply to those areas outside the Headquarters building?

- A. Robert, I thought you were my friend! The parking situation is most, most difficult here at Headquarters. I think to answer your specific question and then take advantage of you giving me a lead to the board on this subject, I might make a few other comments. Those offices that are outside Headquarters in annex buildings and what have you, with the gas shortage and gaslines the way they are, I think that they are encouraged and parking arrangements are geared to encourage them to use the shuttle buses which have been expanded. So we are not encouraging you to bring your private car from the South Building or what have you and park here at Headquarters. That's the name of the game. Although I believe that there are a limited number of parking spots or authorizations to park in visitors parking given to the outlying offices so that they can check it out and somebody can use their personal car coming to headquarters if they so desire. Now, one of the most sensitive subjects you can take up in the CIA is parking arrangements. Everybody's laughter confirmed that piece of intelligence to me. We are not masters of our own fate in this sense and the gas crisis has impacted on us. Number one, we are under the gun from GSA to encourage carpools to a maximum extent and we have to comply. There is no reason on the face of this earth how we can avoid complying with GSA regulations because we are part of the Federal Government. Shocking as it may seem! The other problem which is related to carpools and GSA and gas and maybe parking--we have been averaging six U-drive cars out of the motorpool for people who have to go on official business to other areas before the gas crisis. With the gas crisis it turns out that the average has gone up to 18. Tripled. At the same time your friendly GSA Administrator sent us a letter through the Director saying that you must reduce the motorpool mileage by 20 percent. I'm sympathetic that you want to use your privately-owned vehicles for mileage and have to stand in gaslines. It's perfectly understandable, but I think that when you are going to the Pentagon or what have you, or State Department, and we do have a U-drive it, if you can work out internally in your own offices some technique so that you might carpool that vehicle with other staffers going to the same area at approximately the same time, this will alleviate the situation and thankfully keep GSA off our back.
- Q. What are the Agency's plans for building more buildings in this complex so as eventually everyone will be brought to this area and give up the outlying buildings?
- A. We have plans and I have to admit it's pie in the sky at the moment. We do have a group geared up to study that and it would be very comfortable to move everybody here to what's called the headquarters campus. Conceivably, it would take a special purpose building and would give us great rewards, would reduce courier service, shuttle buses and improve communications and make for more efficient operation. Also, this building was designed for people occupancy and not machine occupancy. If we have the opportunity to convince OMB, the White House, Congress and GSA is now in the act a little bit, that it makes sense for us to improve our efficiency by building a new building, that building would have a large share of it around appli-

cation to machines. In other words, the computers would go there, Commo, maybe the OPS laboratory would go there. There are unique requirements and then we would use the Headquarters principally for people. It would make for a very nice type booking arrangement and could result in economies in the long haul and frankly, that would be one of the arguments to use to get an approval. The thought comes to your mind that really we have ESP--you know, when? I would say certainly not any sooner than five years and maybe not later than eight it it occurs at all. It's not all gravy. Our parking lot has parking spots and, so if we move everybody to Headquarters, you may have strong motivation for carpooling other than the gas crisis. Of course, another building will absorb some of the parking lots, I presume.

ST

Q. Mr. Brownman, it seems that we are reducing personnel overseas and presumably becoming more selective in what the Agency does overseas and I certainly think the key intelligence program question is part of that. With all this, I'm certainly surprised to see that the message volume continues to go up and I wonder what that might be all about?

A. I can't say why for a certainty. I have two explanations or rationalizations of it. One is, with reduced presence overseas there may be a management or operating philosophy specifically in the DDO that control of overseas activities must be at Headquarters and therefore, there is a great deal of traffic related to control--I went to Step A and now what do I do next. That sort of thing. The other, and a Commo operator overseas told me about this, he felt that now that we have gone to automation we write a poetic prose and tones in our messages as opposed to when we had the one-time pad and you had to poke it out yourself, and it was real meat and potatoes, that type of message. So one message could actually be counted as three messages when it goes beyond so many groups and people were just redundant and very flowery duplicative in their messages.

Q. Can you foresee the impact of the privacy of the individual controversy on the M&S in the future?

A. Well, that's a complex question. I'm not sure how to answer it. I think the privacy issue mentioned by President Nixon in his State of the Union Address--I envisioned questions about wiretapping, budgeting and things of that sort and to my shock I found out that he was really referring to privacy of private information in the use of computers. There are some problems relative to that in the country today. I don't think that will make M&S life more complicated. But, also in the privacy area, we do have the polygraph issue and I believe Senator Irvin has a bill relative to polygraph which has passed the Senate. I think its gone that route over the last three or five years and ultimately either gets killed in the House; its never been vetoed. I suspect that this would make for some difficulty. We are very dependent upon the polygraph for selection of new employees and for trying to resolve difficulties.

We think we have a technique in the use of polygraph which protects

the individual, in fact goes to great lengths to protect the individual as well as raise the level of confidence we have that the individual is for us and if that had to go by the board, this would mean no end of hardship and certainly would affect M&S. IT would also affect the whole Agency.

Q. With the reduction of personnel overseas and the opportunity seems slimmer to go overseas, do you feel that the qualifying service of 60 months or five years might be reduced? Is there any thought on that at all?

A. There is no thought on that and I would be kind of surprised if that transpired. I think when you asked that question it showed that you overlooked a basic ingredient in the CIARDS system. When the CIARDS system was approved by Congress there was a ceiling placed upon it that no more than so many people over the first five years could retire under CIARDS and so on, and last April we went through the hammers of hell to get Congress to raise that ceiling to a comfortable level. But, philosophically Congress has said with the existence of a ceiling that CIARDS should not be made available to everybody and that retirement under CIARDS is not the god-given right and prerogative of every employee in this Agency. I think that the fact that there are some people who have the philosophy that, "Good old Jerry, we've got to make sure that he gets his five years so he gets CIARDS," that's a wrong philosophy and I think that you will find with the reduced overseas presence that making sure that everybody gets their five years is not going to be the crucial item. I think it is going to be what is the job and what is his capabilities to do the job.

Q. Mr. Brownman, I'm from the file room, the personnel file room. I didn't have any questions to ask. I just wanted to thank you and those like my supervisor and everybody in Personnel about the Letters of Instruction. I think that's one of the best moves that we have made and I've been here quite a while.

A. Thank you.

Q. Mr. Brownman, to elaborate just a little bit broader on the CIARDS, I think there is a statement in that long disertation on CIARDS, something to the affect that you don't have to have five years overseas. Isn't there something about that in there?

A. Five years of qualifying service and for the equity and to be fair, one of the ways of getting five years of qualifying service is to have five years overseas. But, that's not the only way to achieve five years of qualifying service.